

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-18 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsideration her rejection in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 3, 7-12, 15, 16 and 18 as being allowable, the subject matter of claims 1 and 17 as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections and the subject matter of claims 2, 4-6, 13 and 14 as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness rejections. Although not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, the claims have been amended to overcome the objections and the indefiniteness rejections of the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the Abstract as being more than 150 words. By way of the present Amendment, a new Abstract has been inserted which avoids the legal phraseology and is shorter than 150 words. Accordingly, this objection is overcome.

Claims Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 2 and 17 due to minor errors. In regard to claim 1, Applicants have changed "end" to "ends." In claim 2, line 4, the numeral "(10)" has been inserted. Also, in claim 17, line 2, "is" has been deleted. Accordingly, all of these rejections have now been overcome.

Rejection under 35 USC 112

Claims 2, 4-6, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In regard to claims 2 and 13, the Examiner believes it is unclear whether the square root of the water plane area is for the support column separately or the sum of the areas for the support columns. By way of the present Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 3 to refer to “each of the support columns” to remove this indefiniteness.

In regard to claim 13, Applicants submit that it is not necessary to make any changes since line 2 refers to “each” and line 3 refers to the corresponding water plane area. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome.

With regards to claims 4, 5 and 6, the Examiner states that it is unclear what is meant by the recitation of “at pontoon top level.” By way of the present Amendment, Applicants have amended each of claims 4-6 to indicate which pontoon section is being referred to. In view of this, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome.

CONCLUSION

Since the Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if the claims were amended as required, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now allowable and accordingly the application is fully in allowable form. Accordingly, the allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant